ALEDO ISD BOARD MEETING TEMPLATE

MEETING DATE: February 15, 2016

AGENDA ITEM: Consider Acceptance of the Proposals for Technology Package No. 1 that Provide the Best Value to Aledo ISD Based on Published Selection Criteria and Award Contracts

PRESENTER: Earl Husfeld

ALIGNS TO BOARD GOAL(S): Financial/Facilities – The District shall exhibit excellence in financial and facility planning, management, and stewardship.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

- The items included in Technology Package No. 1 were included within the safety and security and technology components of the District's 2015 Bond Election.
- The line-item components included within Technology Package No. 1 were structured cabling infrastructure, classroom audio visual (AV), and premise security systems in 14 district facilities. The scope of Technology Package No. 1 also included electrical and mechanical work required to support the technology systems.
- During the September 21, 2015 board meeting, competitive sealed proposal (CSP) was selected as the procurement method for this project.

ADMINISTRATIVE CONSIDERATIONS:

- This project was "let out" for proposals on December 18, 2015. Mandatory pre-proposal meetings, followed by facility site walks, were held with interested contractors on January 4th and January 15th.
- The District received nine (9) sealed proposals by the deadline of 2:00 PM on January 28th. Representatives of VLK Architects (VLK), True North Consulting Group (True North), and Aledo ISD, along with representatives of the proposers, opened and read aloud each of the proposals received.
- Following is the Vendor Evaluation and Recommendation Report for your review and consideration. Based upon this analysis, the following companies had the highest scored proposals and offer the best value to the Aledo ISD for the components of Technology Package No. 1:
  - o Proposal 1 – Structure Cabling: Advanced Connections, Inc. (ACI), amount not to exceed $780,351.
  - o Proposal 2 – Classroom AV: ProComputing Corporation, (Promethean Classroom AV), amount not to exceed $2,840,750 and Technology for Education, LLC (TFE), (PA/Bells/Clocks), amount not to exceed $1,294,348.

    - Proposal 3 – Premise Security: Advanced Connections, Inc. (ACI), amount not to exceed $726,498.
    - Proposal 4 – Electrical: Advanced Connections, Inc. (ACI), amount not to exceed $148,060.
    - Proposal 5 – Mechanical: The District received no responses for this component. We will have a recommendation for the Board at a later date.
- Subject to the approval of this item by the Board of Trustees this evening, the District will finalize contract negotiations with each of the listed companies.
- Representatives from True North and VLK are in attendance this evening to answer any questions you may have concerning these projects.

FISCAL NOTE:
The costs of these projects are within the projected budget and will be paid with 2015 bond proceeds.

ADMINISTRATIVE RECOMMENDATION:
The Administration recommends the Board of Trustees approve acceptance of the highest scored proposals received from Advanced Connections, Inc., ProComputing Corporation, and Technology for Education, LLC, and award them the respective components of technology Package No. 1 as presented.

Aledo Independent School District

Cabling, Security and Classroom AV Refresh and Electrical

Technology Package No. 1 – Project No. 1574.00

Vendor Evaluation and Recommendations Report

February 10, 2016

Prepared by

Greg Violette
Reed Taylor
Tony Chojnowski, RCDD/OSP, RTPM

www.vlkarchitects.com www.tncg.com

Summary

Aledo (“AISD”, “the District”) and True North Consulting Group (“TNCG”) issued a Request for Competitive Sealed Proposal (CSP) for #CSP-TechPkg1, Cabling, Security and Classroom AV Refresh and Electrical. The intent of the CSP is to refresh cabling infrastructure, classroom AV, premise security systems, and electrical improvements in fourteen (14) district facilities. The scope also includes electrical and mechanical work required to support the technology systems.

The solicitation was advertised in the local newspaper and sent to major plan rooms. Proposers were given the option of proposing on one or all parts of the CSP.

True North Consulting Group provided VLK with a list of preferred vendors in the District’s area. VLK proceeded to send the CSP package to all of these vendors in an effort to increase the number of quality responses.

Proposers were required to attend a mandatory, pre-proposal conference, followed by campus site walks.

On January 28, 2016, the District received nine (9) proposals that were accepted as qualified proposals that acknowledged all addenda and met the bond and insurance requirements. Multiple proposals were received for Proposals 1-4. The District received no proposals for Proposal - 5 (Mechanical). For the purpose of the evaluation, each component of the CSP were reviewed individually, as follows:

- Proposal 1 - Structured Cabling
- Proposal 2 - Classroom AV
- Proposal 3 - Premise Security
- Proposal 4 - Electrical

The evaluation criteria listed in this recommendation are also included in the CSP documents. Below is a summary of the evaluation committee’s scoring based on the published evaluation criteria. Each technology package was evaluated independently.

Evaluation Criteria Notes

All proposals were evaluated and scored based on the following. This criteria was listed in the published CSP project manual.

Summary of the Evaluation Criteria (100 total points):

Evaluation Criteria		
Item	**Description**	**Percentage Possible**
1	Cost - Base Price	30%
2	Cost - Unit Pricing	5%
3	Proposer: Ability to execute and perform, length of time in business, number of active customers, and company structure.	15%
4	Support: Number of overall full time, installers/technicians, certified technicians, remote and on-site response time guarantee, dispatch distance, and maintenance capabilities.	15%
5	Understanding of requirements: Scope of work, bill of materials	15%
6	References	10%
7	Quality of Proposal	10%
	Total Points	**100%**

A. Cost – Base Price (30 points) – The price included in the CSP response shall be the price evaluated. Respondent is encouraged to include their best prices in their initial response. The lowest cost proposal shall receive 30-points. Other proposals shall receive a percentage of points.

B. Cost – Unit Price (5 points) – The unit prices included in the CSP response shall be the price evaluated. For evaluation purposes, the evaluation team shall use the detailed bill of materials in the Proposer's response.

C. Proposer (15 points) – Ability to execute and perform, length of time in business, number of active customers, and company structure.

D. Support (15 points) – Number of overall full time, installers/technicians, certified technicians, remote and on-site response time guarantee, dispatch distance, and maintenance capabilities.

E. Understanding of requirements – (15 points) – Proposer's understanding of the Scope of Work and completeness of Bill of Materials in proposal.

F. References (10 points):

   7-10 points: All three references are favorable and all three are similar to the project and organization as specified in this CSP.

   4-6 points: All three references are favorable and one or two are not similar to the project and organization as specified in this CSP.

   0-3 points: Any reference provides unfavorable comments about the Proposer. Or all three references are favorable but none are similar to the project and organization as specified in this CSP.

G. Quality of proposal (10 points) – Proposers will be awarded up to 10 points based on the quality of the proposal including providing the correct quantity and all required and requested information in a complete, neat and organized proposal.

Proposal - 1 - Structured Cabling

Cost – Base Price: 30 Points

The lowest cost proposal is awarded full points while the other proposals are awarded points based on a percentage of the lowest proposal. ACI received the full 30 points for having the lowest overall cost. TFE received 25 points and FSG received 17 points.

The District is choosing to accept Add Alternate 1 and is rejecting Add Alternate 2. Add Alternate 1 will be included in base price when determining points awarded.

Company	Cost	Points
ACI	$709,410.00*	30
FSG	$1,216,725.00*	17
TFE	$865,536.00*	25

*Includes base proposal pricing plus Add Alternate 1 Pricing.

Cost – Unit Price: 5 Points

All proposers included unit prices in their proposals. Points for unit pricing are based off of the base proposal cost. Although ACI had the lowest cost base proposal, their unit pricing was substantially higher. For this reason, they were awarded 4 points, rather than the full 5 points. TFE was also awarded 4 points, and FSG was awarded 3 points.

Company	Points
ACI	4
FSG	3
TFE	4

Proposer: 15 points

Proposers were required to provide documentation proving the ability to execute and perform, length of time in business, number of active customers, and company structure. All proposers meet these requirements and have provided the proper documentation to prove as such. All proposers received the full 15 points.

Company	Points
ACI	15
FSG	15
TFE	15

Support Capability: 15 points

Proposers were required to provide documentation regarding their installation methodology, project and maintenance teams experience and certifications, long term product support, and remote and on site response time guarantee. Proposers were also required to provide the quantity of trained service personnel in the District's area.

FSG has twenty (20) trained service personnel in the District's area and received full 15 points. TFE has six (6) trained service personnel in the District's area and received 10 points. ACI was missing full support capability information in their proposal and did not include the total number of trained service personnel in the District's area. ACI did however submit a support agreement plan and several individual support specialist certifications indicating a high number of support personnel, and thus received 14 points.

Company	**Points**
ACI	14
FSG	15
TFE	10

Understanding of Requirements: 15 Points

All Proposers have a complete understanding of the Scope of Work and provided a detailed and complete Bill of Materials to the specifications of the CSP. All proposers are awarded the full 15 points.

Company	**Points**
ACI	15
FSG	15
TFE	15

References: 10 points

Per the CSP, Proposers were required to provide a minimum of three (3) references for work of a similar scope performed for other companies, excluding Aledo ISD. In both the CSP and pre-proposal meeting, it was emphasized that references would be contacted. True North contacted a minimum of two references for each proposer. All Proposers provided required references with favorable responses and were awarded the full 10 points.

Company	Points
ACI	10
FSG	10
TFE	10

Quality of Proposal: 10 points

Proposers were awarded up to 10 points based on the quality of the proposal including providing the correct quantity and all required and requested information in a complete, neat and organized proposal. ACI did not include section 12.02 of the CSP regarding support capability, and was awarded 8 points. FSG failed to include their certificate of liability insurance in their response and was awarded 8 points as well. TFE included all required documents and had a well-organized response, thus receiving the full 10 points.

Company	Points
ACI	8
FSG	8
TFE	10

Evaluation Point Summary

Item evaluated	Possible Points	ACI	FSG	TFE
1. Cost – Base Price	30	30	17	25
2. Cost – Unit Pricing	5	4	3	5
3. Proposer	15	15	15	15
4. Support	15	14	15	10
5. Understanding of Requirements	15	15	15	15
6. References	10	10	10	10
7. Quality of Proposal	10	8	8	10
TOTAL	**100**	**96**	**83**	**90**

Proposal-1 - Structured Cabling Recommendation

True North Consulting Group recommends that Aledo ISD enter into the contract negotiation phase with ACI for Proposal-1 - Structured Cabling (Sections 270000, 271000, 271100, 271300, 271500, 271600 & 271800) for a not to exceed contract amount of $780,351.00 (proposal total of $709,410 plus 10% contingency $70,941.)

True North Consulting Group recommends that Aledo ISD require a performance and payment bond from the Selected Proposer. This requirement was listed in the CSP and all costs are included in the proposal costs by each firm.

Proposal – 2-A – AMX/Schoolview Classroom AV & PA/Bell/Clock

Cost – Base Price: 30 Points

The lowest cost proposal is awarded full points while the other proposals are awarded points based on a percentage of the lowest proposal. TFE had the lowest price proposal, and received the full 30 points. Delcom received 28 points.

Company	Cost	Points
Delcom	$3,968,717.64	28
TFE	$3,769,580.00	30

Cost – Unit Price: 5 Points

All proposers included unit prices in their proposals. Points for unit pricing are based off of the base proposal cost. TFE was awarded the full points and Delcom was awarded 4 points.

Company	Points
Delcom	4
TFE	5

Proposer: 15 points

Proposers were required to provide documentation proving the ability to execute and perform, length of time in business, number of active customers, and company structure. Both proposers meet these requirements and have provided the proper documentation to prove as such. Both proposers received the full 15 points.

Company	Points
Delcom	15
TFE	15

Support Capability: 15 points

Proposers were required to provide documentation regarding their installation methodology, project and maintenance teams experience and certifications, long term product support, and remote and on site response time guarantee. Proposers were also required to provide the quantity of trained service personnel in the District's area.

Delcom has twenty (20) trained service personnel in the District's area and thus received the full 15 points. TFE has six (6) trained service personnel in the District's area and received 10 points.

Company	Points
Delcom	15
TFE	10

Understanding of Requirements: 15 Points

Both proposers have a complete understanding of the Scope of Work and provided a detailed and complete Bill of Materials to the specifications of the CSP. Both proposers are awarded the full 15 points.

Company	Points
Delcom	15
TFE	15

References: 10 points

Per the CSP, Proposers were required to provide a minimum of three (3) references for work of a similar scope performed for other companies, excluding Aledo ISD. In both the CSP and pre-proposal meeting, it was emphasized that references would be contacted. True North contacted a minimum of two references for each Proposer. Both proposers provided required references with favorable responses, and were awarded the full 10 points.

Company	Points
Delcom	10
TFE	10

Quality of Proposal: 10 points

Proposers will be awarded up to 10 points based on the quality of the proposal including providing the correct quantity and all required and requested information in a complete, neat and organized proposal. Both Delcom and TFE included all required documents and had a well-organized response, thus receiving the full 10 points.

Company	Points
Delcom	10
TFE	10

Evaluation Point Summary

Points are summarized in a comparison table listed below on Page 15.

Proposal – 2-B.1 – Promethean Classroom AV

Cost – Base Price: 30 Points

The lowest cost proposal is awarded full points while the other proposals are awarded points based on a percentage of the lowest proposal. ProComputing had the lowest price proposal, and received the full 30 points. TFE received 28 points.

Company	Cost	Points
ProComputing	$2,582,500.00	30
TFE	$2,732,170.00	28

Cost – Unit Price: 5 Points

All proposers included unit prices in their proposals. Points for unit pricing are based off of the base proposal cost. ProComputing was awarded the full 5 points, and TFE was awarded 4 points.

Company	Points
ProComputing	5
TFE	4

Proposer: 15 points

Proposers were required to provide documentation proving the ability to execute and perform, length of time in business, number of active customers, and company structure. Both proposers meet these requirements and have provided the proper documentation to prove as such. Both proposers received the full 15 points.

Company	Points
ProComputing	15
TFE	15

Support Capability: 15 points

Proposers were required to provide documentation regarding their installation methodology, project and maintenance teams experience and certifications, long term product support, remote and on site response time guarantee. Proposers were also required to provide the quantity of trained service personnel in the District's area.

ProComputing has twenty (20) trained service personnel in the District's area and thus received the full 15 points. TFE has six (6) trained service personnel in the District's area and received 10 points.

Company	Points
ProComputing	15
TFE	10

Understanding of Requirements: 15 Points

Both proposers have a complete understanding of the Scope of Work and provided a detailed and complete Bill of Materials to the specifications of the CSP. ProComputing proposed an approved Promethean interactive system and received the full 15 points. TFE proposed a product substitution request with a product with different features and fewer district approved features and was therefore awarded 12 points.

Company	Points
ProComputing	15
TFE	12

References: 10 points

Per the CSP, proposers were required to provide a minimum of three (3) references for work of a similar scope performed for other companies, excluding Aledo ISD. In both the CSP and pre-proposal meeting, it was emphasized that references would be contacted. True North contacted a minimum of two references for each proposer. Both proposers provided required references with favorable responses, and were awarded the full 10 points.

Company	Points
ProComputing	10
TFE	10

Quality of Proposal: 10 points

Proposers will be awarded up to 10 points based on the quality of the proposal including providing the correct quantity and all required and requested information in a complete, neat and organized proposal. Both ProComputing and TFE provided the required documents and had a well-organized response, thus receiving the full 10 points.

Company	Points
ProComputing	10
TFE	10

Evaluation Point Summary

Points are summarized below in the comparison table listed below on Page 13.

Proposal – 2-B.2 – AMX PA/Bells/Clocks

Evaluation Point Summary

TFE submitted the only proposal for Proposal 2-B.2, AMX PA/Bells/Clocks.
TFE's base price for this proposal $1,176,680
Points are summarized below in the comparison table listed below on Page 15.

Proposal 2-A vs. 2-B.1 and 2-B.2 - Classroom AV Recommendation

Evaluation Point Summary

Item evaluated	Possible Points	Delcom	TFE
Proposal-2.A		***2-A***	***2-A***
1. Cost – Base Price	30	28	30
2. Cost – Unit Pricing	5	4	5
3. Ability to Execute and Perform	15	15	15
4. Support	15	15	10
5. Understanding of Requirements	15	15	15
6. References	10	10	10
7. Quality of Proposal	10	10	10
TOTAL	**100**	**97**	**95**

Item evaluated	Possible Points	Pro Computing	TFE	TFE
Proposal-2.B.1 & B.2		***2-B.1***	***2-B.1***	***2-B.2***
1. Cost – Base Price	30	30	28	30
2. Cost – Unit Pricing	5	5	4	5
3. Ability to Execute and Preform	15	15	15	15
4. Support	15	15	10	10
5. Understanding of Requirements	15	15	12	15
6. References	10	10	10	10
7. Quality of Proposal	10	10	10	10
TOTAL	**100**	**100**	**89**	**95**

Lowest Proposal Cost Comparison

Proposal	Company	Cost
2-A	TFE	$3,769,580.00
2-B.1 and 2-B.2	ProComputing and TFE (Combined)	$3,759,180.00

Both Delcom and TFE submitted proposals for proposal 2-A, which was for a combined AMX/Schoolview Classroom AV & PA/Bell/Clock. ProComputing and TFE both submitted proposals for proposal 2-B.1, which was for the Promethean Classroom AV system. Additionally, TFE submitted a proposal for proposal 2-B.2 for a separate AMX PA/Bell/Clock. While proposal 2-A is a turnkey AMX/Schoolview solution, Proposal 2-B.1 and 2-B.2 combined creates a complete solution as well.

After a detailed review of all documentation provided, True North Consulting Group recommends that Aledo ISD enter into the contract negotiation phase with ProComputing for Proposal 2-B.1 - Promethean Classroom AV (Sections 270000, 274000, 274114, 274118) for a not to exceed contract amount of $2,840,750.00 (proposal total of $2,582,500 plus 10% contingency $258,250). Additionally, True North recommends that Aledo ISD enter into the contract negotiation phase with TFE for Proposal 2-B.2 – AMX PA/Bells/Clocks (Sections 270000, 274000, 274114) for a not to exceed contract amount of $1,294,348 (proposal total of $1,176,680 plus 10% contingency $117,668).

Proposal - 3 - Premise Security

Cost – Base Price: 30 Points

The lowest cost proposal is awarded full points, while the other proposals are awarded points based on a percentage of the lowest proposal. ACI received the full 30 points for having the lowest overall cost. TYCO received 27 points, Convergint received 26 points, Climatec received 22 points, Knight Security received 20 points and FSG received 17 points.

Company	Cost	Points
ACI	$660,453.00	30
Climatec	$921,389.89	22
Convergint	$783,677.00	26
FSG	$1,189,127.00	17
Knight Security	$1,014,890.44	20
TYCO	$723,752.27	27

Cost – Unit Price: 5 Points

All proposers included unit prices in their proposals. Points for unit pricing are based off of the base proposal cost. ACI had the lowest average, thus receiving full points. Convergint and TYCO both received 4 points, Climatec received 3 points and both FSG and Knight Security received 2 points.

Company	Points
ACI	5
Climatec	3
Convergint	4
FSG	2
Knight Security	2
TYCO	4

Proposer: 15 points

Proposers were required to provide documentation proving the ability to execute and perform, length of time in business, number of active customers, and company structure. All proposers meet these requirements and have provided the proper documentation to prove as such. All proposers received the full 15 points.

Company	Points
ACI	15
Climatec	15
Convergint	15
FSG	15
Knight Security	15
TYCO	15

Support Capability: 15 points

Proposers were required to provide documentation regarding their Installation methodology, project and maintenance teams experience and certifications, long term product support, and remote and on site response time guarantee. Proposers were also required to provide the quantity of trained service personnel in the District's area.

Both Convergint and TYCO more than forty (40+) trained service personnel in the District's area and received the full 15 points. FSG has twenty (20) trained service personnel in the District's area and also received the full 15 points. ACI was missing full support capability information in their proposal and did not include the total number of trained service personnel in the District's area. ACI did however submit a support agreement plan and several individual support specialist certifications indicating a high number of support personnel, and thus received 14 points. Knight Security has five (5) trained service personnel in the District's area, and Climatec has 8 trained service personnel in the District's area. Both Knight and Climatec received 10 points.

Company	Points
ACI	14
Climatec	10
Convergint	15
FSG	15
Knight Security	10
TYCO	15

Understanding of Requirements: 15 Points

All proposers have a complete understanding of the Scope of Work and provided a detailed and complete Bill of Materials to the specifications of the CSP. All proposers are awarded the full 15 points.

Company	Points
ACI	15
Climatec	15
Convergint	15
FSG	15
Knight Security	15
TYCO	15

References: 10 points

Per the CSP, proposers were required to provide a minimum of three (3) references for work of a similar scope performed for other companies, excluding Aledo ISD. In both the CSP and pre-proposal meeting, it was emphasized that references would be contacted. True North contacted a minimum of two references for each proposer. All proposers provided required references with favorable responses, and were awarded the full 10 points.

Company	Points
ACI	10
Climatec	10
Convergint	10
FSG	10
Knight Security	10
TYCO	10

Quality of Proposal: 10 points

Proposers will be awarded up to 10 points based on the quality of the proposal including providing the correct quantity and all required and requested information in a complete, neat and organized proposal. All proposers included all required documents and had well-organized responses, thus receiving the full 10 points.

Company	Points
ACI	10
Climatec	10
Convergint	10
FSG	10
Knight Security	10
TYCO	10

Evaluation Point Summary

Item evaluated	Possible Points	ACI	Climatec	Convergint	FSG	Knight Security	TYCO
1. Cost – Base Price	30	30	22	26	17	20	27
2. Cost – Unit Pricing	5	5	3	4	2	2	4
3. Ability to Execute and Perform	15	15	15	15	15	15	15
4. Support	15	14	10	15	15	10	15
5. Understanding of Requirements	15	15	15	15	15	15	15
6. References	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
7. Quality of Proposal	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
TOTAL	**100**	**99**	**85**	**95**	**84**	**82**	**96**

Proposal - 3 - Premise Security Recommendation

True North Consulting Group recommends that Aledo ISD enter into the contract negotiation phase with ACI for Proposal - 3 - Premise Security (Sections 270000, 276000, 276200 & 276400) for a not to exceed contract amount of $726,498.00 (proposal total of $660,453 plus 10% contingency $66,045).

True North Consulting Group recommends that Aledo ISD require a performance and payment bond from the Selected Proposer. This requirement was listed in the CSP and all costs are included in the proposal costs by each firm.

Proposal - 4 - Electrical

Cost – Base Price: 30 Points

The lowest cost proposal is awarded full points while the other proposals are awarded points based on a percentage of the lowest proposal. ACI received the full 30 points for having the lowest overall cost. FSG received 14 points.

ACI's base price for this proposal $134,600.00
FSG's base price for this proposal $291,110.00

Company	Cost	Points
ACI	$134,600.00	30
FSG	$291,110.00	14

Cost – Unit Price: 5 Points

Proposers were required to provide unit pricing for all proposals. Neither proposer provided a detailed BOM or unit pricing with their proposals, thus both proposers received 0 points.

Company	Points
ACI	0
FSG	0

Proposer: 15 points

Proposers were required to provide documentation proving the ability to execute and perform, length of time in business, number of active customers, and company structure. All proposers meet these requirements and have provided the proper documentation to prove as such. All proposers received the full 15 points.

Company	Points
ACI	15
FSG	15

Support Capability: 15 points

Proposers were required to provide documentation regarding their installation methodology, project and maintenance teams experience and certifications, long term product support, and remote and on site response time guarantee. Proposers were also required to provide the quantity of trained service personnel in the District's area.

FSG has twenty (20) trained service personnel in the District's area and received full 15 points. ACI was missing full support capability information in their proposal and did not include the total number of trained service personnel in the District's area. ACI did however submit a support agreement plan and several individual support specialist certifications indicating a high number of support personnel, and thus received 14 points.

Company	Points
ACI	14
FSG	15

Understanding of Requirements: 15 Points

Both Proposers have a complete understanding of the Scope of Work and provided a detailed and complete Bill of Materials to the specifications of the CSP. Both proposers are awarded the full 15 points.

Company	Points
ACI	15
FSG	15

References: 10 points

Per the CSP, Proposers were required to provide a minimum of three (3) references for work of a similar scope performed for other companies, excluding Aledo ISD. In both the CSP and pre-proposal meeting, it was emphasized that references would be contacted. True North contacted a minimum of two references for each proposer. Both Proposers provided required references with favorable responses, and were awarded the full 10 points.

Company	Points
ACI	10
FSG	10

Quality of Proposal: 10 points

Proposers were awarded up to 10 points based on the quality of the proposal including providing the correct quantity and all required and requested information in a complete, neat and organized proposal. ACI did not include section 12.02 of the CSP regarding support capability, and was awarded 8 points. FSG failed to include their certificate of liability insurance in their response and was awarded 8 points as well.

Company	Points
ACI	8
FSG	8

Evaluation Point Summary

Item evaluated	Possible Points	ACI	FSG
1. Cost – Base Price	30	30	14
2. Cost – Unit Pricing	5	0	0
3. Ability to Execute and Perform	15	15	15
4. Support	15	14	15
5. Understanding of Requirements	15	15	15
6. References	10	10	10
7. Quality of Proposal	10	8	8
TOTAL	**100**	**92**	**77**

Proposal-4 - Electrical Recommendation

True North Consulting Group recommends that Aledo ISD enter into the contract negotiation phase with ACI for Proposal-4 - Electrical (Sections 270000,260012, 260500, 260505, 260519, 260526, 260533, 260534, 260535, 260553, & 262425) for a not to exceed contract amount of $148,060.00 (proposal total of $134,600 plus 10% contingency $13,460).

True North Consulting Group recommends that Aledo ISD require a performance and payment bond from the Selected Proposer. This requirement was listed in the CSP and all costs are included in the proposal costs by each firm.